

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Appl. No. : 10/711,361 Confirmation No. 5360  
Applicants : Bonerb, Timothy C.  
Filed : 09/14/2004  
TC/A.U. : 3652  
Examiner : Fox, Charles A.  
Docket No. : BON.US.55  
Customer No. : 24111

**Commissioner for Patents**

**P.O. Box 1450**

**Alexandria VA 22313-1450**

**RESPONSE**

The Applicant thanks the Office for the careful consideration given to his application in the communication mailed 01/17/2008. In that communication, Claims 1, 2, and 7, 8, 10 – 18, 20 – 27 and 29 – 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bailey et al. in view of Ivchenko et al. and further in view of Bonnel. The claims are not presented in this Response because they are not being amended.

In response, the Applicant points out that the Office has not made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness in that the Office has not indicated any teaching, suggestion, motivation, or any reason for combining the cited references to make the claimed invention. For example, claims 1 and 11 require at least five pie shaped zones and one donut shaped zone surrounding a container outlet. The cited references have either the donut shape or the pie shaped zones, but not a combination of different types. Because no reason for making the combination has been stated by the Office, the Applicant suggests that Claims 1 and 11 are allowable.

Also, claim 1 requires providing air “alternately” to the donut shaped zone